arXiv:hep-ph/9701271v1 12 Jan 1997

I. INTRODUCTION

It is widely believed that the Universe started by big bang. When the temperature dropped to a few hundred MeV, the Universe experienced a phase transition from the quark-gluon plasma (QGP) phase to the hadron phase. If the phase transition was of the first order, the system went through the mixed phase of the quark-gluon and the hadron phases. In this case, the Universe would have become inhomogeneous. Such a non-uniform scenario of the early Universe was studied by several authors in terms of the primordial nucleosynthesis and the existence of the strange quark matter, which may be a candidate of the dark matter [1] - [3]. The condition of forming non-uniform Universe depends largely on the property of the QCD phase transition as the critical temperature T_c and the surface tension α. Although QCD is the theory of quarks and gluons, it is difficult to solve its dynamics to get such information.

Hence, we resort to large numerical simulations in the framework of the lattice QCD theory. The critical temperature and the behavior of the phase transition are investigated by the lattice simulations. In the pure gauge case, the phase transition is of the first order and the critical temperature is $T_c = 0.26 \sim 0.28$ GeV [4,5]. On the other hand, the full QCD simulation provides $T_c \sim 0.15$ GeV and the order of the phase transition is under debate [6]. The surface tension between the confining and deconfining phases has been also investigated with the Monte Carlo simulation [7,8], in particular, on a large lattice as $36^2 \times 48 \times 6$ [9]. The recent calculations of the surface tension α provide the surface tension at $\alpha/T_c^3 = 0.0292$ for $N_t = 4$ and $\alpha/T_c^3 = 0.0218$ for $N_t = 6$, where N_t is the value of temporal extents. Taking $T_c = 0.26$ GeV, we find $\alpha^{1/3} = 80$ MeV for $N_t = 4$ and $\alpha^{1/3} = 73$ MeV for $N_t = 6$. Here, the surface tension obtained in the lattice QCD is the value at the thermodynamical critical temperature. In general, it is hard to get the information on the metastable state from the lattice simulation, and therefore the upper and the lower critical temperatures [10], for instance, cannot be obtained by the lattice QCD.

On the other hand, the dual Ginzburg-Landau (DGL) theory was developed as the infrared effective theory of quarks and gluons [11,12]. In the DGL theory, color confinement is provided by QCD-monopole condensation, which naturally appears by taking a particular gauge, the 't Hooft abelian gauge [13]. The recent lattice QCD simulations indicate that the abelian part of gluons plays dominant roles at low energy, while the non-diagonal gluons are irrelevant in the suitably chosen abelian gauge, which is called as the abelian dominance [11,14]. Hence, the non-diagonal gluons can be neglected in the DGL theory. The DGL theory was able to describe the linear potential between a static quark-antiquark pair and at the same time the spontaneous chiral symmetry breaking [12,16]. The crucial role of monopole condensation on confinement and the abelian dominance were clearly observed in the recent lattice simulations [17]- [20]. The deconfinement phase transition at finite temperature is studied in terms of the effective potential using the DGL theory [10,21]. We are then able to extract the surface tension from the bump structure of the effective potential as a function of the QCD-monopole condensate [16].

The bubble formation was discussed by Kajino in the ultra-relativistic heavy-ion collisions, where QGP of order of the volume; $V \sim (10\,\mathrm{fm})^3$ might be formed [2]. On the way of hadronization, the QGP phase may cool down to experience the mixed phase of the QGP and hadron, just as the case of big bang. In this case, however, the size of each bubble is small and hence we ought to take into account the finite volume effect for the surface tension.

In ultra-relativistic heavy-ion collisions, we face at another mixed phase system. Just after the heavy-ion collisions, the color-flux tube of finite size might be formed. The interior of the flux tube is in the deconfinement phase while the outside is in the confinement phase. In stead of the temperature effect in the case of the ordinary mixed phase, the deconfinement region is produced by the color-electric field in the same manner as the vortex solution in superconductivity. We are also able to investigate this case in the DGL theory. Thus, in the latter coexistence system, the color electric field plays the essential role.

We study in this paper the surface tensions of these mixed phase systems in the DGL theory. We consider the flat surface case, where the two phases are separated by one flat plane. We study also the various geometry effect on the surface tension by considering various boundary shapes.

This paper is organized as follows. In Sect. 2, we describe the properties of the coexistence system using the DGL theory at finite temperature. The surface tensions are extracted for the flat surface case and also for the spherical case with various radii. In Sect. 3, we study the vortex configurations in the DGL theory at zero temperature. We study the surface tensions for the flat surface case and for the cylindrical configuration case. Sect. 4 is devoted to the summary of the present study and the discussion.

II. THE SURFACE TENSION AT FINITE TEMPERATURE

The dual Ginzburg-Landau (DGL) theory is based essentially on the abelian gauge fixing *a la* 't Hooft in non-abelian gauge theory as QCD, which results in the appearance of the magnetic monopole. In the construction of the DGL theory, only two assumptions are made

i) The abelian dominance. The low energy phenomena or the long range behaviors of the quark-gluon dynamics are dominated by the abelian part and the non-abelian part can be neglected.

ii) The monopole condensation. The magnetic monopole is condensed due to the self-interaction, which lead to the color confinement [22].

These assumptions are strongly supported in the lattice gauge theory [17,18].

A. DGL Effective Potential at Finite Temperature

We consider the deconfinement phase transition at finite temperature. At the quenched level, the DGL Lagrangian can be expressed in terms of the dual gauge fields $\vec{B}_\mu$ and the monopole fields χ_a,

$$\mathcal{L}_{DGL} = -\frac{1}{4}(\partial_\mu \vec{B}_\nu - \partial_\nu \vec{B}_\mu)^2 + \sum_{a=1}^{3} \left[|(\partial_\mu - ig\vec{\epsilon}_a \cdot \vec{B}_\mu)\chi_a|^2 - \lambda(|\chi_a|^2 - v^2)^2 \right] \qquad (1)$$

Here, $\vec{\epsilon}_a$, which are the root vectors of SU(3), define the magnetic charges of the monopole fields. The dual gauge fields $\vec{B}_\mu$ are defined on the dual manifold of the Cartan subalgebra, $\vec{B}_\mu = (B^3_\mu, B^8_\mu)$. The dual gauge coupling constant g satisfies the Dirac condition, $eg = 4\pi$, with e being the gauge coupling constant [16]. At zero temperature, the monopole condensate is given as $|\chi_a| = v$ at the mean field level for all a=1,2,3 due to the self-interaction term. We know that the Lagrangian is the dual version of the Ginzburg-Landau theory of superconductor. The main difference from the Ginzburg-Landau theory is the existence of the Weyl symmetry of SU(3) group [20], which stems from the SU(3)$_c$ gauge of QCD.

We derive the effective potential at finite temperature by introducing the quadratic external field, $J\sum_{a=1}^{3}|\chi_a|^2$ [10]. The generating functional is written as

$$\begin{aligned} Z[J] &= \langle 0|Te^{-i\int d^4x J\sum_{a=1}^{3}|\chi_a|^2}|0\rangle \\ &= \int D\chi_a D\vec{B}_\mu \exp\left(i\int d^4x(\mathcal{L}_{DGL} - J\sum_{a=1}^{3}|\chi_a|^2)\right) \equiv e^{iW[J]}. \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

We rewrite the monopole field as

$$\chi_a = (\bar{\chi} + \tilde{\chi}_a)e^{i\xi_a}, \tag{3}$$

where the vacuum expectation value $\bar{\chi} \equiv |\langle 0|\chi_a|0\rangle|$ is independent of the index a due to the Weyl symmetry. Here, the phase value ξ_a is absorbed in the dual gauge field $\vec{B}_\mu$ and turns into its longitudinal component.

The DGL Lagrangian is written as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{DGL} - J\sum_{a=1}^{3}|\chi_a|^2 = &-3\lambda(\bar{\chi}^2 - v^2)^2 - 3J\bar{\chi}^2 \\ &-\frac{1}{4}(\partial_\mu\vec{B}_\nu - \partial_\nu\vec{B}_\mu)^2 + \frac{1}{2}m_B^2\vec{B}_\mu^2 + \sum_{a=1}^{3}[(\partial_\mu\tilde{\chi}_a)^2 - m_\chi^2\tilde{\chi}_a^2] \\ &+2\sum_{a=1}^{3}[-2\lambda\bar{\chi}(\bar{\chi}^2 - v^2) - J\bar{\chi}]\tilde{\chi}_a \\ &+\sum_{a=1}^{3}[g^2(\vec{\epsilon}_a\cdot\vec{B}_\mu)^2(\tilde{\chi}_a^2 + 2\bar{\chi}\tilde{\chi}_a) - \lambda(4\bar{\chi}\tilde{\chi}_a^3 + \tilde{\chi}_a^4)], \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

where $m_B = \sqrt{3}g\bar{\chi}$ and $m_\chi = \sqrt{2\lambda(3\bar{\chi}^2 - v^2) + J} = 2\sqrt{\lambda}\bar{\chi}$. Here, source J is related to the mean field $\bar{\chi}$, $J = -2\lambda(\bar{\chi}^2 - v^2)$, through the condition that the linear term of $\tilde{\chi}_a$ vanishes in Eq.(4).

We obtain the partition function $Z[J]$ by integrating over the quadratic part of $\vec{B}_\mu$ and $\tilde{\chi}_a$ up to the one-loop level. The Legendre transform of the partition function gives the effective action as

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma(\bar{\chi}) &= -i\ \ln\ Z[J] + \int 3J\bar{\chi}^2 d^4x \\ &= -\int 3\lambda(\bar{\chi}^2 - v^2)^2 d^4x + i\ \ln\ Det(iD_B^{-1}) + 3\frac{1}{2}i\ \ln\ Det(iD_\chi^{-1}), \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

$$D_B = \left(g_{\mu\nu} - \frac{k_\mu k_\nu}{m_B^2} \right) \frac{i}{k^2 - m_B^2 + i\epsilon}, \tag{6}$$

$$D_\chi = \frac{-i}{k^2 - m_\chi^2 + i\epsilon}, \tag{7}$$

where factor 3 originates from the degrees of freedom of the QCD-monopole. Using the imaginary time formalism, the effective potential V_{eff} at finite temperature is obtained as [10],

$$\begin{aligned} V_{\text{eff}}(\bar{\chi}; T) = 3\lambda(\bar{\chi}^2 - v^2)^2 &+ 3\frac{T}{\pi^2} \int_0^\infty dk\, k^2 \ln\left(1 - e^{-\sqrt{k^2+m_B^2}/T}\right) \\ &+ \frac{3}{2}\frac{T}{\pi^2} \int_0^\infty dk\, k^2 \ln\left(1 - e^{-\sqrt{k^2+m_\chi^2}/T}\right), \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

where the temperature dependent terms are derived from the functional determinants in the momentum representation in Eq.(6) and Eq.(7).

As for the parameters of the DGL theory for our investigation of the surface tension, we consider two cases. In one case, we take the parameter set so as to reproduce the inter-quark potential [12]. We use this parameter set (case A) as the standard one to discuss all the features of deconfinement phase transition, since many non-perturbative phenomena have been discussed with this parameter set in the DGL theory [10,12,16]. This case corresponds to the dual superconductor of type-II, in which $m_\chi > m_B$.

In the other case (case B), we try to readjust the DGL parameters in order to take into account the recent lattice QCD results. With lattice QCD simulations for the SU(3) gauge theory, the critical temperature has been studied in great detail. The continuum limit is given as [4],

$$T_c/\sqrt{k_s} = 0.625 \pm 0.03$$

with the expected systematic shift of 0.004 due to the infinite volume extrapolation of the critical couplings. With the use of the string tension, $\sqrt{k_s} = 0.42$ GeV, we get a critical temperature of $T_c \sim 0.26$ GeV. Another constraint on the model parameters can be obtained from the scalar glueball mass, because the QCD-monopole in the DGL theory should appear as a scalar glueball with the mass about 1 - 2 GeV [16]. Very recently, Weingarten *et al.* [23] worked out the enormous calculation on the mass spectrum and the decay pattern of low-lying glueballs using the lattice QCD, and concluded that $f_0(1710)$ is identical to the lowest scalar glueball

with $J^{\pi} = 0^{++}$. Therefore, we identify the QCD-monopole with this scalar-glueball candidate $f_0(1710)$, and adopt $m_\chi = 1.71$ GeV for the QCD-monopole mass at $T = 0$. There is some indications on the type of the dual superconductor; the QCD vacuum corresponds to the case between type-I and type-II [24,25]. Since this part is not fully agreed upon by the specialists, we vary m_B from 0.5 GeV to 2.0 GeV in order to study the parameter dependence of the surface tension. We take therefore,
case A: $\lambda = 25$, $v = 0.126\,\mathrm{GeV}$ and $g = 2.3$, which provides $m_\chi = 1.26\,\mathrm{GeV}$ and $m_B = 0.5\,\mathrm{GeV}$. The string tension is fixed to $k_s = 1.0$ GeV/fm, which corresponds to $\sqrt{k_s} = 0.444$ GeV.
Case B: $m_\chi = 1.71$ GeV, $\sqrt{k_s} = 0.42$ GeV and m_B is changed form 0.5 GeV to 2.0 GeV.

In order to get the feeling of the behavior of the free energy at finite temperature, we discuss here the results for case A. If we keep the coupling constants at finite temperature in the DGL Lagrangian as those fixed by the properties of the QCD vacuum at zero temperature, the critical temperature comes out to be too high, $T_c = 0.49$ GeV, as compared to the lattice results. Since we work with the effective Lagrangian, we could vary any of the coupling constants with temperature. In fact, the asymptotic free property suggests the reduction of the coupling strength as the temperature increases. We follow the work of Ichie *et al.* [10] and take temperature dependence for λ as

$$\lambda(T) = \lambda \left(\frac{T_c - aT}{T_c} \right), \tag{9}$$

and fix the parameter a so as to reproduce $T_c = 0.28\,\mathrm{GeV}$. They have found $a = 0.88$ and discussed the properties of various quantities at finite temperature. We show in Fig. 1 the behavior of the effective potential in this case. At small T, the absolute minimum in V_{eff} appears at finite $\bar{\chi}$, which is indicated by ×. The minimum point of $\bar{\chi}$ moves towards the smaller value with temperature. Around $T_{low} \sim 0.26\,\mathrm{GeV}$, the local minimum appears at $\bar{\chi} = 0$. This local minimum becomes the absolute one at the critical temperature, $T_c = 0.28\,\mathrm{GeV}$. At $T > T_c$, the absolute minimum stays at $\bar{\chi} = 0$, which physically corresponds to the deconfinement phase.

We should make one more comment on the lower critical temperature T_{low}. It is defined as the temperature at which a local minimum of V_{eff} appears at the trivial vacuum $\bar{\chi} = 0$. T_{low} is exactly derived using the high temperature expansion [26] as

$$T_{low} = 2v \left(\frac{6\lambda(T_{low})}{2\lambda(T_{low}) + 3g^2} \right)^{1/2} . \tag{10}$$

We find $T_{low} = 0.262\,\mathrm{GeV}$ for case A. We can check this formula through the agreement with the numerical calculations as shown in Fig.1. We get similar results for case B for the free energy.

B. The Surface Tension on the Flat Interface at Finite Temperature

In general, a mixed phase is realized for the case of the first-order phase transition. In the mixed phase, the system consists of two different phases, which are divided by an interface. The free energy densities of both phases are equal there. The free energy of the mixed phase is different from the sum of the two free energies by the amount $F_s = \alpha S$, where S is the area of the interface and α is the surface tension, which is the energy per unit interface.

In the DGL theory, such a mixed phase consists of the QGP and the hadron phases. The free energy of the system is estimated using the effective potential $V_{\rm eff}(\bar{\chi}; T)$ as

$$F(\bar{\chi}; T) = \int d^3x \left[3\ (\nabla\bar{\chi})^2 + V_{\rm eff}(\bar{\chi}; T) \right] , \tag{11}$$

where $\bar{\chi}(x)$ is the monopole condensate in Eq.(3). The coefficient 3 of $(\nabla\bar{\chi})^2$ is the degree of freedom of monopoles originated from the Weyl symmetry for the SU(3) case.

The surface tension on the planar interface can be estimated analytically, when the effective potential $V_{\rm eff}(\bar{\chi}, T_c)$ between two minima at T_c is approximated by a sine curve [16]. We show in Fig. 2 $V_{\rm eff}(\bar{\chi}, T_c)$ and the approximate sine curve,

$$V_{\rm sin}(\bar{\chi}) = \frac{h}{2} \left(1 - \cos \frac{2\pi\bar{\chi}}{\bar{\chi}_H} \right) , \tag{12}$$

where $\bar{\chi}_H$ is the monopole condensate at the non-trivial local minimum of the effective potential, and h is the barrier height of the effective potential between $\bar{\chi} = 0$ and $\bar{\chi} = \bar{\chi}_H$. Here, we set $V_{\rm eff}(0; T_c) = V_{\rm eff}(\bar{\chi}_H; T_c) = 0$. In this case, the system holds translational invariance in the direction parallel to the interface. Hence, $\bar{\chi}$ depends only on z-coordinate perpendicular to its flat interface, and the surface tension is reduced to the one-dimensional integration over the energy density,

$$\alpha_\infty[\bar{\chi}_{\rm sin}] = \int dz \left[3 \left(\frac{d\bar{\chi}_{\rm sin}}{dz} \right)^2 + V_{\rm sin}(\bar{\chi}_{\rm sin}) \right]. \tag{13}$$

Here, we use α_∞ because the flat surface case can be regarded as the hadron bubble with the infinite radius. The field equation for $\bar{\chi}_{\rm sin}(z)$ is found to be the sine-Gordon (SG) equation, and can be solved analytically as [16]

$$\bar{\chi}_{\rm sin}(z) = \frac{2\sqrt{6}}{3} \bar{\chi}_H \tan^{-1} e^{z/\varepsilon} \tag{14}$$

with $\varepsilon = \frac{\sqrt{3}}{\pi} \frac{\bar{\chi}_H}{\sqrt{h}}$. Here, 2ε denotes the thickness of the boundary between the two phases. Substituting this solution into the expression for the surface tension in Eq.(13),

$$\alpha_\infty = \frac{4\sqrt{3}}{\pi} \sqrt{h} \bar{\chi}_H. \tag{15}$$

Using the formula, we find $\alpha_\infty^{1/3} = 114\,{\rm MeV}$ for case A.

On the other hand, the surface tension on the planar interface is also calculated numerically from $V_{\rm eff}$ directly. The profile of $\bar{\chi}(z)$ is given by the differential equation as

$$\frac{d^2\bar{\chi}}{dz^2} = \frac{1}{6} \frac{\partial V_{\rm eff}}{\partial \bar{\chi}}, \tag{16}$$

which is derived by the minimization condition of the free energy in Eq.(11). The surface tension is expressed as

$$\alpha_\infty = \int dz \left[3 \left(\frac{d\bar{\chi}}{dz} \right)^2 + V_{\rm eff}(\bar{\chi}) \right]. \tag{17}$$

We solve Eq.(16) for $\bar{\chi}$ and find $\alpha_\infty^{1/3} = 117\,{\rm MeV}$ for case A. This value is very close to the analytical result using Eq.(15). Hence, the use of the sine-Gordon (SG) kink solution in Eq.(14) is good for the surface tension. This result seems to be consistent with the recent lattice results, $\alpha_\infty^{1/3} = 80\,{\rm MeV}$ for $N_t = 4$ and 73 MeV for $N_t = 6$ [9].

We study also the parameter dependence of the surface tension. In the superconductivity, the Ginzburg-Landau (GL) parameter κ is useful for categorizing the superconductor in terms of the magnetic response; the type I and type II superconductors correspond to $\kappa < 1/\sqrt{2}$ and $\kappa > 1/\sqrt{2}$, respectively. This GL parameter is also meaningful for the dual superconductor picture of the QCD vacuum given by

$\kappa = m_\chi/\sqrt{2}m_B$ in the DGL theory. Some lattice simulations suggest that the QCD vacuum would correspond to the case near the border ($\kappa = 1/\sqrt{2}$) between type-I and type-II [25]. In order to understand the behavior of the surface tension with respect to κ, we investigate various cases with $0.61 < \kappa < 2.4$ in the case B. We list in Table 1 m_B, κ, g, λ, v, $\lambda(T = T_c)$ and $v(T = T_c)$. Here, we introduce also the temperature dependence of $v(T = T_c)$, in the same manner as the temperature dependence of $\lambda(T = T_c)$. $v(T = T_c)$ is obtained by varying v so as to reproduce $T_c \sim 0.26$ GeV as λ is fixed to the value at zero temperature.

We show in Fig. 3 surface tensions α_∞, which are derived by using $\lambda(T = T_c)$ and $v(T = T_c)$ as a function of the GL parameter κ. The surface tensions decrease with κ. The surface tension is found to be $108\text{MeV} \leq \alpha_\infty^{1/3} \leq 241\text{MeV}$ for this range of κ. If the mass m_B is small, the value of the surface tension is close to the value, $\alpha^{1/3} = 80$ MeV, obtained in the lattice QCD simulations [9].

Coleman discussed the scenario of the bubble formation in the early Universe [27]. In the thermal history of the Universe, as the temperature drops gradually across the critical temperature T_c in the early Universe, the hadron bubble formation in the bulk QGP phase begins at T_c. It is considered that the phase transition from the QGP phase to the hadron phase is completed above T_{low}, because the latent heat turns into the shock wave emission from the hadron bubble in the beginning of the phase transition and its reheating effect suppresses the formation of new hadron bubbles.

When $T > T_c$, the system is in the deconfinement phase. Near T_c, only extremely large hadron bubble can be formed, since the formation of a mixed phase necessarily needs the additional surface energy and the free energy of two bulk phases are almost equivalent [28,29]. For $T_{low} < T < T_c$, the finite radius $R(T)$ of the hadron bubble is determined by the balance between the volume and the surface energies of a bubble. There appears the energy difference between the interior and the exterior regions of the bubble, $\Delta V(T) = |\, V_{\text{eff}}(0;T) - V_{\text{eff}}(\bar{\chi}_H;T)\,|$, as a source to compensate the extra free energy density caused by the interface region. The sizable bubble configuration is allowed energetically [27,28]. From this consideration, we may assume that only the volume energy and the surface energy contribute to the free energy $F(T)$ as,

$$F(T) \simeq -\Delta V(T)\frac{4\pi}{3}R(T)^3 + \alpha_\infty 4\pi R(T)^2, \tag{18}$$

where the source term is approximated by the surface tension of the infinite size bubble α_∞. In many studies, the surface tension of the finite size bubble $\alpha(R)$ is replaced by that of the infinite size bubble for simplicity, even for the free energy of the finite size bubble. For a small bubble, its free energy would be largely different from $F(T)$ evaluated by Eq.(16). For the realistic estimation on the free energy of the hadron bubble, we ought to consider the curvature effect on the surface tension.

C. The Surface Tension in the Hadron Bubble with the Spherical Geometry

We discuss, here, the radial dependence of the surface tension of hadron droplets in the bulk QGP phase below T_c. The free energy of a hadron bubble in the spherical geometry is given by

$$F(\bar{\chi};T) = \int dr 4\pi r^2 \left\{ 3\left(\frac{d\bar{\chi}}{dr}\right)^2 + V_{\text{eff}}(\bar{\chi};T) \right\}, \tag{19}$$

where $\bar{\chi} = \bar{\chi}(r)$ is the solution of the equation of motion in the spherical coordinate,

$$\frac{d^2\bar{\chi}}{dr^2} = -\frac{2}{r}\frac{d\bar{\chi}}{dr} + \frac{1}{6}\frac{\partial V_{\text{eff}}}{\partial \bar{\chi}} \tag{20}$$

with the boundary conditions for the hadron bubble; $\bar{\chi} = \bar{\chi}_H$ at $r = 0$ and $\bar{\chi} = 0$ at $r \to \infty$.

Generally, in 1+d dimensional scalar theory, the soliton equation does not necessarily have a nontrivial static solution because of the Derrick theorem [30]. The 1+1 dimensional field equation, which corresponds to Eq.(16), has always the solution to stabilize the free energy because the scale transformation as $r' = \eta r$ for $F_\eta(\bar{\chi}, T)$ supplies a stable point on η,

$$\begin{aligned} F_\eta(\bar{\chi};T) &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dr' \left[3\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial r'}\bar{\chi}(r')\right)^2 \eta + V_{\text{eff}}[\bar{\chi}(r')]\frac{1}{\eta} \right] \\ &= \eta \quad (\text{Kinetic part}) + \frac{1}{\eta}\ (\text{Potential part}). \end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

On the other hand, if d $\geq$ 2, there exist no nontrivial solutions, because the scale transformation of the radial coordinate does not make the free energy stable. For instance, in 1+3 dimensional case, which corresponds to Eq.(20). There is no stable point on η in the free energy, $F_\eta(\bar{\chi};T)$ as

$$F_\eta(\bar{\chi};T) = \int_0^\infty 4\pi dr' r'^2 \left[3\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial r'}\bar{\chi}(r')\right)^2 \frac{1}{\eta} + V_{\text{eff}}[\bar{\chi}(r')]\frac{1}{\eta^3}\right]$$
$$= \frac{1}{\eta} \quad \text{(Kinetic part)} + \frac{1}{\eta^3} \quad \text{(Potential part)}. \qquad (22)$$

Thus, there is no nontrivial static solution in the 1+3 dimensional scalar field theory, even if one resorts to any numerical methods. However, our aim is not to find the static solution of Eq.(19), but is to study the properties and dynamics of the hadron bubbles, which appear due to the thermal fluctuation at the early Universe. In general, the hadron bubbles are unstable against the scale transformation, so that they should expand or shrink as the time goes [29].

Here, we concentrate ourselves on the fixed size hadron bubble with the spherical geometry, and study its dynamical evolution in terms of the surface tension. When the bubble radius is large enough, the solution of Eq.(20) in spherical coordinate is reduced to that of the flat surface case, since we can neglect the first term in the right hand side at $R \to \infty$. We adopt the "sine-Gordon (SG) kink form" [29] for the profile function of the monopole condensate $\bar{\chi}(r)$,

$$\bar{\chi}(r) = \bar{\chi}_H \frac{\tan^{-1} e^{(R-r)/\rho}}{\tan^{-1} e^{R/\rho}}, \qquad (23)$$

which reproduces the exact form of Eq.(16) at T_c. As shown in Fig. 4, R is the bubble radius defined at the half of the monopole condensate $\bar{\chi}_H$ at which V_{eff} is absolute minimum and 2ρ corresponds to the thickness of the interface. We normalize the profile function so as to satisfy $\bar{\chi}(r=0) = \bar{\chi}_H$, which is the non-trivial minimum of the effective potential. In the supercooling environment, we take the minimization condition by making the free energy in Eq.(19) minimum for a fixed radius R by varying ρ, in other words, by changing the inclination of the SG-kink curve. We show in Fig. 5(a) and Fig. 5(b) the profile of the monopole condensate $\bar{\chi}(r)$ and the free energy density at $T = 0.2795\,\text{GeV}$, as an example. As seen in Fig. 5(b), the free energy density is negative inside the bubble and positive at the bubble surface.

Subsequently, we plot the free energies for various radii R in Fig. 5(c) at $T = 0.2795\,\text{GeV}$ as the typical case. The free energy has a peak at the critical bubble radius R_c, that is, a branch radius for a bubble to shrink or grow during the phase transition. In general, there appears the critical radius R_c at any temperature from T_{low} to T_c. One finds that Fig. 5(c) behaves in the same manner as the free energy in Eq.(18), although now the surface term is calculated more accurately.

We estimate the surface tension at R_c, because the creation of the hadron bubble with R_c is relevant in the hadronization process. Once R_c is defined at various temperatures, the surface tension of the hadron bubble is derived by the substitution of α_∞ for $\alpha[R(T)]$ in Eq.(18),

$$\alpha(R_c) = \frac{1}{4\pi R_c^2}\left\{F(\bar{\chi};T) + \Delta V(T)\frac{4\pi}{3}R_c^3\right\}, \tag{24}$$

where the volume energy $\Delta V(T)$ does not dependent on R_c at each temperature.

For case A at $0.278\,\mathrm{GeV} \leq T \leq 0.2799\,\mathrm{GeV}$, the radial dependence of the surface tension is shown at various temperatures in Fig. 6(a). One finds $\alpha(R_c)$ gradually approaches α_∞ with R_c. On the other hand, $\alpha(R_c)$ increases rapidly with decreasing R_c below $R_c \sim 30$fm, although this behavior seems of inconsistent with Kajantie *et al.*'s assertion [31] on the surface tension.

This behavior of the increase of $\alpha(R_c)$ at small R_c can be explained from the increase of the surface energy by the derivative term $\partial\bar{\chi}/\partial r$. As shown in Fig. 6(b), the thickness of the bubble wall, which is about several fm, is found larger than that in the lattice study [32]. The behaviors of the free energy at various temperatures are shown in Fig. 6(c). They are similar to the behaviors of the free energy in Eq.(18). However, quantitatively, there is a difference between the free energies with α_∞ and $\alpha(R_c)$ in the low energy region of interest for hadronization. As for case B, $\alpha[R(T)]$ behaves similarly as that of case A.

We show the critical bubble radius R_c during the phases transition at various temperatures in Fig. 7. Hadron bubbles would be born with various sizes corresponding to each temperature, and then would grow up with the expansion of the Universe. The slight decrease of the temperature rapidly makes the possible bubble radius small. Since the bubble formation rate is expressed as $P \propto \exp\{-4\pi R_c(T)^3 h(T)/3T\}$, with h being the barrier height between the false vacuum and the true one, the formation rate of the hadron bubble is drastically changed with temperature near T_c.

III. THE SURFACE TENSION ON THE FLUX TUBE

We study here the surface tension in the color-flux tube system with considering the geometrical effect of the tube. In the relativistic heavy-ion collisions, the huge size color flux tube is produced between the target and the projectile. This scenario of forming huge size color flux tube has been pointed out by Ichie *et al.* [33].

In the previous section, the coexistence of the two phases is brought by the thermal effect. On the other hand, the deconfinement phase is realized by the external color-electric field for the flux tube system. Hence, to begin with, one should consider the free energy of the QCD system with the external color-field. In the case of the flux tube, the deconfinement phase contributes to the equivalence of the free energies of each phase by the induced color-magnetic current in the confinement phase. This configuration is easily inferred by analogy with the coexisting system of the superconductor immersed in the magnetic field. The interior of the flux tube corresponds to the normal phase in the superconductor and its exterior corresponds to the superconducting phase.

First, we rewrite the interaction terms of the monopoles χ_a and the dual gauge fields $\vec{B}_\mu$ in the DGL Lagrangian into the simple form similar to the well-known GL theory. The dual gauge fields $\vec{B}_\mu = (B^3_\mu, B^8_\mu)$ are induced by the color current brought by each quark-antiquark pair in the flux tube. The quark charges $\vec{Q}_a = (Q^3_a, Q^8_a)$ determine the ratio of B^3_μ on B^8_μ as

$$\begin{aligned}
\vec{B}_\mu &= \left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}}\right) B_\mu \qquad &&\text{for} \qquad \vec{Q}_1 = \left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}}\right) e, \\
\vec{B}_\mu &= \left(-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}}\right) B_\mu \qquad &&\text{for} \qquad \vec{Q}_2 = \left(-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}}\right) e, \\
\vec{B}_\mu &= \left(0, -\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\right) B_\mu \qquad &&\text{for} \qquad \vec{Q}_3 = \left(0, -\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\right) e.
\end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

As for $\vec{B}_\mu$, the relevant terms appearing in the DGL Lagrangian are $\vec{\epsilon}_a \cdot \vec{B}_\mu$, which have cyclic property on the index a,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\vec{\epsilon}_1 \cdot \vec{B}_\mu = 0, \quad \vec{\epsilon}_2 \cdot \vec{B}_\mu = -\vec{\epsilon}_3 \cdot \vec{B}_\mu = -\frac{1}{2} B_\mu, \qquad \text{for} \quad Q_1 - \bar{Q}_1, \\
&\vec{\epsilon}_2 \cdot \vec{B}_\mu = 0, \quad \vec{\epsilon}_3 \cdot \vec{B}_\mu = -\vec{\epsilon}_1 \cdot \vec{B}_\mu = -\frac{1}{2} B_\mu, \qquad \text{for} \quad Q_2 - \bar{Q}_2, \\
&\vec{\epsilon}_3 \cdot \vec{B}_\mu = 0, \quad \vec{\epsilon}_1 \cdot \vec{B}_\mu = -\vec{\epsilon}_2 \cdot \vec{B}_\mu = -\frac{1}{2} B_\mu, \qquad \text{for} \quad Q_3 - \bar{Q}_3.
\end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

Here, $\vec{\epsilon}$ is the root vector of SU(3),

$$\vec{\epsilon}_1 = \left(-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}\right), \qquad \vec{\epsilon}_2 = \left(-\frac{1}{2}, -\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}\right), \qquad \vec{\epsilon}_3 = (1, 0). \tag{27}$$

It should be mentioned that two non-trivial field equations for χ_a become equal, and there is one trivial solution $|\chi| = v$, which is determined by the energy minimum condition. As a result, we find the following relations of the components of χ for each color charges of quarks,

$$\begin{aligned} &|\chi_1| = v, \quad |\chi_2| = |\chi_3| = |\chi|, \quad \text{for} \quad Q_1 - \bar{Q}_1, \\ &|\chi_2| = v, \quad |\chi_3| = |\chi_1| = |\chi|, \quad \text{for} \quad Q_2 - \bar{Q}_2, \\ &|\chi_3| = v, \quad |\chi_1| = |\chi_2| = |\chi|, \quad \text{for} \quad Q_3 - \bar{Q}_3. \end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

From this consideration, whichever the quark-antiquark pair we take, the DGL Lagrangian (1) should be reduced to,

$$\mathcal{L}_{DGL} = -\frac{1}{3} \cdot \frac{1}{4}(\partial_\mu B_\nu - \partial_\nu B_\mu)^2 + 2|(\partial_\mu - igB_\mu)\chi|^2 - 2\lambda(|\chi|^2 - v^2)^2. \tag{29}$$

Furthermore, we rescale the fields and the coupling constants as

$$B_\mu \to \sqrt{3} B_\mu, \qquad \chi \to \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\chi, \qquad \lambda \to 2\lambda, \qquad g \to \frac{2}{\sqrt{3}} g, \qquad v \to \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} v, \tag{30}$$

which reduce $\mathcal{L}_{DGL}$ into the GL type Lagrangian for the superconductor theory,

$$\mathcal{L}_{DGL} = -\frac{1}{4}(\partial_\mu B_\nu - \partial_\nu B_\mu)^2 + |(\partial_\mu - igB_\mu)\chi|^2 - \lambda(|\chi|^2 - v^2)^2. \tag{31}$$

From now on, we use this simple Lagrangian with the rescaled variables.

A. The Surface Tension in the Mixed Phase with Color-Electric Field: Flat Surface Case

To begin with, we consider the ordinary surface tension on the flat surface case, which can be regarded as the infinite radius limit for the cylindrical flux tube.

Let us set the interface yz-plane ($x = 0$). Then, the system essentially depends only on the x-coordinate. The differential equations are given by the minimum conditions of the free energy F; $\delta F/\delta\chi^* = 0$ and $\delta F/\delta\mathbf{B} = 0$. Taking $\mathbf{B} = (0, B(x), 0)$ and $\nabla \times \mathbf{B} = \mathbf{D} = (0, 0, D(x))$, they are found to be

$$(i\nabla + g\mathbf{B})^2\chi - 2\lambda v^2\chi + 2\lambda|\chi|^2\chi = 0 \tag{32}$$

$$\nabla \times \mathbf{D} + 2g^2|\chi|^2\mathbf{B} = 0. \tag{33}$$

We impose the boundary condition as $\bar{\chi} = 0$ and $D = E_c$ at $x \to -\infty$ (normal phase), and $\bar{\chi} = v$ and $D = 0$ at $x \to +\infty$ (superconducting phase).

In this mixed phase, the color flux is regarded as the external field for the non-perturbative vacuum so that we take into account the contribution from the external field as $-\int E\, dD$. Here, the induced color-electric field D is brought by the external field E. If E is independent from D, the free energy of the system with the external fields $\tilde{f}$ is represented as $\tilde{f} = f_0 + f - DE_c$, where f is the free energy contributed by the change of the monopole condensate and f_0 is that of the whole system without the external fields. On the other hand, the free energy in the normal phase at $x \to -\infty$ is $\tilde{f}_E = f_0 - E_c^2/2$ because $D = E_c$ and $-\int E\, dD = -\int D\, dD|_{D=E_c} = -E_c^2/2$. Here, E_c denotes the critical color-electric field and is determined so as to fill the gap between the free energy densities for $\chi = 0$ and $\chi = v$ as $E_c^2/2 = \lambda v^4$. Hence, one can rewrite $\tilde{f}_E = f_0 - \lambda v^4$ The surface tension on the flat interface is given by the difference between $\tilde{f}$ and $\tilde{f}_E$,

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma_\infty &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx(\tilde{f} - \tilde{f}_E) \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx \left[\frac{D^2}{2} + \left|\frac{d\chi}{dx}\right|^2 - g^2B^2|\chi|^2 - 2\lambda v^2|\chi|^2 + \lambda|\chi|^4 - E_cD + \frac{E_c^2}{2}\right].\end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

In order to make these equations simple, it is convenient to introduce dimensionless variables expressed as $\hat{x} \equiv x/\delta$, $\hat{\chi} \equiv \chi/v$, $\hat{B} \equiv B/(E_c\delta)$ and $\hat{D} \equiv d\hat{B}/d\hat{x} = D/E_c$. The GL parameter κ is given as

$$\kappa^2 \equiv \frac{\delta^2}{\xi^2} = \frac{1}{2}\frac{\frac{1}{m_B^2}}{\frac{1}{m_\chi^2}} = \frac{\lambda}{g^2}, \tag{35}$$

where δ is the penetration length of the color-electric field $\delta = 1/m_B$ and ξ is the coherent length of the monopole condensate as $\xi = \sqrt{2}/m_\chi$. As the definition, $\kappa \leq 1/\sqrt{2}$ corresponds to the type-I superconductor and $\kappa \geq 1/\sqrt{2}$ the type-II superconductor, respectively.

The field equations written with the dimensionless variables are

$$\hat{\chi}'' = \kappa^2\left[\frac{1}{2}\hat{B}^2\hat{\chi} - \hat{\chi} + \hat{\chi}^3\right] \tag{36}$$

$$\hat{B}'' = \hat{\chi}^2\hat{B}. \tag{37}$$

The boundary conditions are given by $\hat{\chi} = 0$, $\hat{D} = 1$ at $x \to -\infty$ and $\hat{\chi} = 1$, $\hat{D} = 0$ at $x \to \infty$. The surface tension is simply expressed as

$$\sigma_\infty = \int \delta E_c^2 \left[\frac{2}{\kappa^2} \hat{\chi}'^2 + \hat{B}'(\hat{B}' - 1) \right] d\hat{x}. \tag{38}$$

We show in Fig. 8 $\sigma_\infty^{1/3}$ versus κ with the parameter set B. $\sigma_\infty^{1/3}$ moves from 180 MeV to -310 MeV for $0.61 \le \kappa \le 2.4$, when m_χ is fixed as $m_\chi = 1.71$ GeV. At $\kappa = 1/\sqrt{2}$, the QCD vacuum is just at the border between type-I and type-II of the dual superconductor, and the surface tension is zero, which is consistent with the ordinal superconductivity.

It is a remarkable feature that the surface tension may be negative in the type-II dual superconductor. In this case, it is more stable that a thick flux tube splits into many flux tube units, because the larger interface of many flux tubes make the free energy of the whole system lower. Hence, the huge flux tube would be unstable against the splitting, which may provide the inhomogeneity in the QGP formation.

B. The Surface Tension in the Flux Tube with Cylindrical Geometry

We consider here the color flux tube with cylindrical geometry, and study the finite size effect on the surface tension in the flux tube. Setting the flux tube along the z-axis, the color-electric fields $\mathbf{D}(r) = (0, 0, \frac{1}{r}\frac{d}{dr}(r\, B_\phi))$ is given by the vector potential $\mathbf{B} = (0, B_\phi(r), 0)$ using the cylindrical coordinates (r, ϕ, z). Taking the monopole field as $\chi = \chi(r) e^{in\phi}$, the DGL equations (32) and (33) are expressed as

$$\frac{1}{\hat{r}}\frac{d}{d\hat{r}}\left(\hat{r}\frac{d\hat{\chi}}{d\hat{r}}\right) = \kappa^2 \left[\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{\sqrt{2}}{\kappa}\frac{n}{\hat{r}} - \hat{B} \right)^2 \hat{\chi} - \hat{\chi} + \hat{\chi}^3 \right], \tag{39}$$

$$-\frac{d}{d\hat{r}}\frac{1}{\hat{r}}\frac{d}{d\hat{r}}\left(\hat{r}\hat{B}_\phi\right) = \left(\frac{\sqrt{2}}{\kappa}\frac{n}{\hat{r}} - \hat{B} \right)^2 \hat{\chi}^2 \tag{40}$$

with the dimensionless variables as $\hat{r} = r/\delta$, $\hat{\chi} = \chi/v$, $\hat{B} = B/(E_c\delta)$ and $\hat{D} = \hat{B}' + \hat{B}/r = (B' + B/r)/E_c$.

Using the cylindrical coordinate, the surface tension is written in the same manner as the flat interface case,

$$\sigma(R) = \frac{1}{2\pi R} \int \frac{E_c^2 \delta}{2} \left[\frac{2}{\kappa^2}\hat{\chi}'^2 + \left(\frac{\sqrt{2}}{\kappa}\frac{n}{\hat{r}} - \hat{B} \right)^2 \hat{\chi}^2 - 2\hat{\chi}^2 + \hat{\chi}^4 + (\hat{D} - 1)^2 \right] 2\pi\hat{r}d\hat{r}, \tag{41}$$

where R is the cylindrical radius of the flux tube. Here, we define the flux tube boundary as the point satisfying, $\hat{\chi} = 0.5$, that is, the monopole condensate χ takes the half value at the boundary.

The integer n is the winding number related to the flux quantization, and corresponds to the vortex number in the superconductivity. We study the profile function $\chi(r)$ of monopole field with various number of n. In discussing the radius and the multiple winding number, it is meaningful only for type-I case, $\sigma(R) > 0$, where one large size flux tube is preferred. Otherwise, the negative surface tension leads the fragmentation of the huge flux tube into many thinner flux units. The numerical results for $\chi(r)$ are shown in Fig. 9(a) and (b), using the parameter set, $\kappa = 0.61$, $m_\chi = 1.71\,\mathrm{GeV}$, $m_B = 2.0\,\mathrm{GeV}$ and $v = 0.163$ GeV, which corresponds to the type-I superconductor. In Fig. 9(b), we plot the numerical results on the flux tube radius R and the winding number n. Here, we add the fitting curve, $R = \bar{r}\sqrt{n}$ with $\bar{r} = 0.21$ fm. Thus, R increases proportionally with $\sqrt{n}$. From $n = 1$ data in Fig. 9(a), the radius of one flux tube is estimated about $\bar{r} = 0.21$ fm. As the physical interpretation, the thick flux tube with the winding number n can be regarded as the gathering system of n flux tubes with the radius $\bar{r}$ and unite winding number, and therefore its cross section S is given as $S = \pi R^2 \sim n\pi\bar{r}^2$. The surface tension $\sigma(R)$ goes down with the radius R related to n, and asymptotically approaches to σ_∞ in the flat surface case at $R \to \infty$ as shown in Fig. 10.

IV. CONCLUSION

In the dual Ginzburg-Landau theory, we have studied the surface tensions in two different systems. One is the mixed phase near the critical temperature and the other is the coexistence system of two phases with external color-electric field at zero temperature.

The surface tension at finite temperature is a relevant quantity for the argument of the bubble formation in the big bang scenario. In particular, the huge surface tension leads to strong inhomogeneity in the early Universe [1], which affects primordial nucleosynthesis and the formation of the strange quark matter. Not only for the cosmology, the surface tension is important also for the QGP creation in the ultra-relativistic heavy-ion collision. We have investigated the surface tension for the hadron bubbles appearing in the QGP phase using the SG-kink curve ansatz for the profile of the monopole condensate.

In the flat surface case at the critical temperature, we have first approximated the effective potential by a sine curve to investigate the mixed phase analytically. We have thus obtained the useful analytical expressions for the surface tension and the thickness of the boundary surface in terms of the shape parameters of the effective potential. We have then calculated the surface tension numerically, and have verified the validity of the analytical formulae. The surface tension α_∞ is obtained as $\alpha_\infty^{1/3} = 117\mathrm{MeV}$ for case A, where case A corresponds to a typical parameter set for type-II dual superconductor.

We have studied the surface tension with varying the Ginzburg-Landau parameter $\kappa = m_\chi/\sqrt{2}m_B$. The value for the surface tension is $108\mathrm{MeV} \le \alpha_\infty^{1/3} \le 241\mathrm{MeV}$ for $0.61 \le \kappa \le 2.4$. The surface tension tends to be small for large κ case corresponding to the type-II dual superconductor. These values should be compared with $\sigma^{1/3} = 80$ MeV obtained by lattice QCD simulations.

We have studied also the finite size effect on the surface tension in the hadron bubble with various radii for $T_{low} < T < T_c$. To this end, we have taken an ansatz for the profile function $\chi(r)$ of the monopole condensate in the radial coordinate. Using a fixed value of the bubble radius R, the thickness parameter ρ is determined by the minimization condition of the free energy. The free energy of the hadron bubble has a maximum at the "critical" radius R_c, which is a branch radius of a bubble to shrink or grow during the phase transition. We have estimated then the surface tension at the critical radius R_c, $\alpha[R_c(T)]$, as the relevant case for the created hadron bubble [29]. We have found that $\alpha(R_c)$ stay almost the value at α_∞ down to the radius $R_c \sim 30\mathrm{fm}$, $\alpha(R_c)$ tends to increase with decreasing R_c.

We have studied also the surface tension in the mixed phase with the external color-electric fields at zero temperature. Such a mixed phase would be formed in the early stage of ultra-relativistic heavy-ion collisions [33]. We have examined the surface tension in the flat surface case, as the large flux tube limit, for the various Ginzburg-Landau parameter $\kappa = m_\chi/\sqrt{2}m_B$ near the boarder of the type-I and type-II dual superconductor. We have found $-310\,\mathrm{MeV} \le \sigma_\infty^{1/3} \le 180\,\mathrm{MeV}$ for $0.61 \le \kappa \le 2.4$, when m_χ is fixed to $m_\chi = 1.71$ GeV. In the type-I dual superconductor with

$\kappa \le 1/\sqrt{2}$, the surface tension σ_∞ is positive, so that many flux tubes tend to fuse into single huge flux tube [33]. On the other hand, in the type-II case with $\kappa \ge 1/\sqrt{2}$, σ_∞ is negative, which means that the large size color flux tube is unstable against the separation into many thinner flux tubes. The surface tension vanishes, $\sigma_\infty = 0$ just at the border between type-I and type-II dual superconductor ($\kappa = 1/\sqrt{2}$).

Finally, we have formulated also the surface tension in a huge color flux tube with the large winding number n, which corresponds to the vortex number in the superconductivity. We find a simple relation between the radius R and the winding number n, $R = \sqrt{n}\bar{r}$, where $\bar{r}$ is approximately the radius of the unite flux tube. The surface tension $\sigma(R)$ goes down to the asymptotic value σ_∞ as $R \to \infty$. Quantitatively, $\sigma(R)$ can be regarded σ_∞ for $R > 2$fm.

H. M. acknowledges the hospitality of the Theory Group at RCNP-Osaka during her stay at RCNP, where this study has been worked out. We are grateful to Prof. T. Kajino for fruitful discussions on the QCD phase transition in the early Universe.

REFERENCES

[1] E. Witten, Phys. Rev. **D30** (1984) 272.

[2] T. Kajino, Phys. Rev. Lett. **66** (1991) 125.
T. Kajino, M. Orito, T. Yamamoto and H. Suganuma, Proc. of Int. Workshop on "Color Confinement and Hadrons", edited by H. Toki *et al.*, (World Scientific, 1995) 263.

[3] K. Sumiyoshi, T. Kajino, C.R. Alcock and G.J. Mathews, Phys. Rev. **D42** (1990) 3963.

[4] F. Karsch, Proc. of the Int. Workshop on "Color Confinement and Hadrons", edited by H.Toki *et al.*, (World Scientific, 1995) 109.

[5] J. Fingberg, U. Heller and F. Karsch, Nucl. Phys. **B392** (1993) 493.
G.S. Bali, C. Schlichter and K. Schilling, Nucl. Phys. **B** (Proc. Suppl.) **34** (1994) 216.

[6] Y. Iwasaki, K. Kanaya, S. Kaya, S. Sakai and T. Yoshie, Nucl. Phys. **B** (Proc. Suppl.) **47** (1996) 515.

[7] K. Kajantie, L. Kärkkäinen and K. Rummukainen, Phys. Lett. **B223** (1989) 213; Nucl. Phys. **B357** (1991) 693.

[8] S. Huang, J. Potvin, C. Rebbi and S. Sanielevici, Phys. Rev. **D42** (1990) 2864.

[9] Y. Iwasaki, K. Kanaya, L. Karkkainen, K. Rummukainen and T. Yoshie, Phys. Rev. **D49** (1994) 3540.
Y. Aoki and K. Kanaya, Phys. Rev. **D50** (1994) 6921.

[10] H. Ichie, H. Suganuma and H. Toki, Phys. Rev. **D52** (1995) 2944.

[11] T. Suzuki, Prog. Theor. Phys. **80** (1988) 929.
S. Maedan and T. Suzuki, Prog. Theor. Phys. **81** (1989) 229.

[12] H. Suganuma, S. Sasaki and H. Toki, Nucl. Phys.**B435** (1995) 207.
H. Toki, H. Suganuma and S. Sasaki, Nucl. Phys. **A577** (1994) 353c.
H. Toki, S. Sasaki, H. Ichie, H. Monden and H. Suganuma, J. Korean Phys. Soc. (Proc. Suppl.) **29** (1996) S346.

[13] G. 't Hooft, Nucl. Phys. **B190** (1981) 455.

[14] Z.F. Ezawa and A. Iwazaki, Phys. Rev. **D25** (1982) 2681; **D26** (1982) 631.

[15] S. Sasaki, H. Suganuma and H. Toki, Phys. Lett. **B387** (1996) 145.
S. Sasaki, H. Suganuma and H. Toki, Prog. Theor. Phys. **94** (1995) 373.
S. Sasaki, H. Suganuma and H. Toki, Proc. of Int. Conf. on "Baryons '95", Santa Fe (World Scientific, 1996) 555.

[16] H. Suganuma, S. Sasaki, H. Toki and H. Ichie, Prog. Theor. Phys. (Suppl.) **120** (1995) 57.
H. Suganuma, H. Ichie, H. Monden, S. Sasaki, M. Orito, T. Yamamoto and T. Kajino, Proc. of "PANIC '96", Williamsburg, May 1996 (World Scientific) in press.

[17] A.S. Kronfeld, M.L. Laursen, G. Schierholz and U.-J.Wiese, Phys. Lett. **B198** (1987) 516.
A.S. Kronfeld, G. Schierholz and U.-J.Wiese, Nucl. Phys. **B293** (1987) 461.

[18] S. Hioki, S. Kitahara, S. Kiura, Y. Matsubara, O. Miyamura, S. Ohno and T. Suzuki, Phys. Lett. **B272** (1991) 326.
S. Hioki, S. Kitahara, S. Ohno, T. Suzuki, Y. Matsubara and O. Miyamura, Phys. Lett. **B285** (1992) 343.

[19] O. Miyamura and S. Origuchi, Nucl. Phys. **B** (Proc. Suppl.) **42** (1995) 538.

[20] H. Suganuma, A. Tanaka, S. Sasaki and O. Miyamura, Nucl. Phys. **B** (Proc. Suppl.) **47** (1996) 302.

[21] H. Monden, T. Suzuki and Y. Matsubara, Phys. Lett. **B294** (1992) 100.

[22] H.B. Nielsen and P. Olesen, Nucl. Phys. **B61** (1973) 45.

[23] J. Sexton, A. Vaccarino and D. Weingarten, Nucl. Phys. **B** (Proc. Suppl.) **47** (1996) 128.

[24] S. Maedan, Y. Matsubara and T. Suzuki, Prog. Theor. Phys. **84** (1990) 130.

[25] Y. Matsubara, S. Ejiri and T. Suzuki, Nucl. Phys. **B** (Proc. Suppl.) **34** (1994) 176.

[26] L. Dolan and R. Jackiw, Phys. Rev. **D9** (1974) 3320.

[27] S. Coleman, Phys. Rev. **D15** (1977) 2929; **D16** (1977) 1248.

[28] A.D. Linde, Nucl. Phys. **B216** (1983) 421.

[29] H. Ichie, H. Monden, H. Suganuma and H. Toki, Proc. of Int. Symp. on "Nuclear Reaction Dynamics of Nucleon-Hadron Manybody System", Osaka, Dec. 1995 (World Scientific, 1996) 246.
H. Suganuma, H. Ichie, H. Toki and H. Monden, Proc. of Int. Workshop on "Nuclear Reaction and Particle Cosmo Physics", Atami, Japan, Jan. 1996, in press.

[30] R. Rajaraman, "Solitons and Instantons", North-Holland (1982) 1.

[31] K. Kajantie, J. Potvin and K. Rummukainen, Phys. Rev. **D47** (1993) 3079.

[32] K. Kajantie, L. Kärkkäinen and K. Rummukainen, Nucl. Phys. **B333** (1990) 100.
R. Brower, S. Huang, J. Potvin and C. Rebbi, Phys. Rev. **D46** (1992) 2703.

[33] H. Ichie, H. Suganuma and H. Toki, Phys. Rev. **D54** (1996) 3382.

Figure Captions

Fig.1 The effective potential $V_{\rm eff}(\chi, T)$ as the function of the monopole condensate $\bar{\chi}$ at various temperatures for case A. The temperature dependence of the variable self-coupling $\lambda(T)$ is fixed so as to provide the critical temperature at $T_c = 0.28\,\mathrm{GeV}$. The absolute minimum at each temperature is denoted by the symbol $\times$. At $T_c = 0.28\,\mathrm{GeV}$, there appear two absolute minima.

Fig.2 The effective potential $V_{\rm eff}(\bar{\chi}, T_c)$ at the critical temperature (denoted by solid curve) versus the monopole condensate $\bar{\chi}$ for case A. The dashed curve denotes an approximate sine curve. Here, h corresponds to the barrier height on the transition between the hadron and the QGP phases, and $\bar{\chi}_H(T_c)$ denotes the value for the monopole condensate at the non-trivial minimum. The energy level is set so as to $V_{\rm eff} = 0$ at $\bar{\chi} = 0$.

Fig.3 The surface tension as a function of the Ginzburg-Landau parameter κ for case B. The surface tension $\alpha_\infty^{1/3}$ decreases with κ. The solid curve is obtained by taking the linear temperature dependence for $\lambda(T)$ so as to reproduce the critical temperature at $T = 0.26$ GeV, while other parameters are fixed. As comparison, the dashed curve is the case with temperature dependent $v(T)$, while other parameters as λ are fixed to the zero temperature value.

Fig.4 The profile of the hadron bubble in terms of the monopole condensate $\bar{\chi}(r)$ near the critical temperature $T_c = 0.28\,\mathrm{GeV}$ for case A. The solid curve denotes the exact solution calculated from $V_{\rm eff}(\bar{\chi}, T)$. The dashed curve denotes the SG-kink ansatz, $2\bar{\chi}_H \tan^{-1} e^{(R-r)/\rho}/\pi$, where $\bar{\chi}_H$ is the monopole condensate at the non-trivial minimum of $V_{\rm eff}(\bar{\chi}, T)$.

Fig.5 (a) An example of the monopole profile function $\bar{\chi}(r)$, approximated by the SG-kink curve, as a function of the radial coordinate r. (b) The corresponding free energy density. The width of the peak of the free energy density corresponds to the thickness of the bubble wall. (c) The total free energy of the hadron bubble as the function of various bubble radii R. The critical radius R_c is defined at the saddle point of the free energy at each temperature. In this example for case A, R_c is around 26 fm at $T = 0.2795$GeV.

Fig.6 (a) The surface tension $\alpha^{1/3}$ as a function of the critical radius R_c for various temperatures, 0.278 GeV $\leq T \leq$ 0.28 GeV. The values added nearby the curve correspond to the temperatures in unit of GeV. (b) The profiles of the monopole condensate at the critical radius R_c at various temperature, $T =$ 0.278 GeV, 0.2798 GeV and 0.2799 GeV. The horizontal axis denotes the radial coordinate r. The dashed vertical lines show the thickness of the bubble wall at each temperature. (c) The solid curve denotes the free energy of the hadron bubble with the radius R at various temperatures (0.2795 GeV, 0.2797 GeV and 0.2798 GeV) evaluated from the effective potential. The dashed curve denotes the free energy approximated by a sum of the volume and the surface terms, where α_∞ is used.

Fig.7 The critical radius R_c versus the temperature T for case A. R_c increases rapidly with T and goes up to infinity at the critical temperature T_c.

Fig.8 The surface tension σ_∞ for the flat interface as a function of the Ginzburg-Landau parameter κ. This range of κ corresponds to $0.5\,\mathrm{GeV} \leq m_B \leq 2.0\,\mathrm{GeV}$ and $m_\chi = 1.71\,\mathrm{GeV}$ and $\sqrt{k_s} = 0.42$ MeV. At $\kappa = 1/\sqrt{2}$, the QCD vacuum is just at the border between type-I and type-II in terms of the dual superconductor.

Fig.9 (a) The profile of the monopole condensate $\bar{\chi}(r)$ as a function of the radial coordinate r for the flux-tube system with various winding numbers n. (b) Relation between the flux tube radius R and n (denoted by black dots) for $\kappa = 0.61$ corresponding to the type-I dual superconductor. Here, the masses are $m_B = 2.0\,\mathrm{GeV}$ and $m_\chi = 1.71\,\mathrm{GeV}$. This behavior is well reproduced by the dotted curve $R = \bar{r}\sqrt{n}$, where $\bar{r} = 0.21$ fm is almost the radius of the single flux tube with $n = 1$.

Fig.10 The surface tension $\sigma^{1/3}(R)$ as a function of the radius R of the flux tube. The used parameters are the same as in Fig.9. Here, σ_∞ is the value in the flat surface case.